

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

May 17, 2016

2:00 p.m.

Department of Education
700 East Fifth Street
Board Conference Room
Carson City, Nevada

And

Department of Education
9890 South Maryland
Board Conference Room
Las Vegas, Nevada

MINUTES OF REGULATION WORKSHOPS

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

In Carson City

Karen Johansen, Administrative Assistant

In Las Vegas

Steve Canavero, Deputy Superintendent, Student Achievement

Dena Durish, Deputy Superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT:

In Carson City

Greg Ott, Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

In Carson City

Anna Savala, Washoe County School District

Tom Reagan, Great Basin College

Jose Delfin, Carson City School District

Mary Pierczynski, Nevada Association of School Superintendents

Keli Brown, Southern Nevada College

Beth Bouchard, Southern Nevada College

In Las Vegas

Donna Elder, National University Henderson Campus,

Dr. Emily Lin, University of Las Vegas

Rob Askey, Touro University Nevada

Craig Stevens, Clark County School District

Dottie Smith, The New Teacher Project

Jessica Bouchte, Clark County School District
Jennifer Varrato, Clark County School District
Michael Robison,
Lindsey Diamond, University of Las Vegas
Doris Watson, University of Las Vegas
Allison Smith, University of Las Vegas

The meeting was called to order at 2:02 p.m.

Public Comment #1

There was no public comment.

Workshop to Solicit Comments on Proposed Amendments to NAC 391.557 Requirements for application for approval of course; manual (NRS 385.080, 391.019, 391.037, 391.038) and NAC 391.558 Procedure and requirements for review of applications and approval of courses; provisional and final approval; denial, expiration and renewal of approval; review of course; annual reports by school district; fee. (NRS 385.080, 391.019, 391.037, 391.038)

The workshop was opened at 2:03 p.m. There were six individuals present in Carson City and 11 individuals present in Las Vegas.

Dena Durish, deputy superintendent, Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement stated pursuant to NRS 391.038 the State Board has the authority to review and approve educator preparation programs. These are traditional teacher preparation programs for licensure. Steve Canavero, superintendent of public instruction noted the changes in language are in line with federal Title II of the higher education act. Deputy Durish explained these regulations have not been amended with substantive changes for at least 15 years and they are not in alignment with federal requirements. Informal workgroups comprised of preparation programs from national and local organizations met and provided feedback on the process.

Michelle Sposito, education programs professional, stated that NAC 391.557 is regarding the requirements for a program provider to submit an application for approval and NAC 391.558 is about the requirements for the criteria to approve. She delineated the proposed [changes in language for NAC 391.557 and 558](#) that were provided at the workshop.

Steve Canavero, superintendent of public instruction, reiterated and discussed the proposed changes in language.

Public Comment

Dottie Smith, Teachers and Leaders Council (TLC), said it is helpful to frame the updates. She added that NAC 391.557, 3 (m), related to a needs assessment, is fantastic because teacher prep programs are being asked to work with districts to understand their teacher vacancy needs and ensure they are filling pipelines toward those vacancy needs. She suggested even more explicate language could be used about the collaboration because it is ensuring teacher preparation programs are working with districts to fill their needs.

Ms. Smith underscored needing a mechanism for recognizing highly effective programs. A teacher candidate will likely decide where they want to spend their money and time to become a teacher and choose programs that are going to be top notch. Under NAC 391.558, 13 (e) the first-year Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF) ratings is a good example of where Nevada is now and where it is going. She asked if the

mechanism for tracking retention data is on the horizon. Deputy Durish responded that with the expansion of Infinite Campus and requesting an online licensure management application and tracking program in July that an RFP will be submitted where the two systems will communicate. From the minute a candidate walks in the door the data will track in-state programs and which states teachers are being attracted from.

Dr. Canavero asked for clarification about a comment Ms. Smith made regarding the NEPF. Ms. Smith clarified that the way it is written now, the state will receive the overall rating of a teacher, not necessarily the observation tool. She suggested if programs are taking the NEPF, the rubric or high leverage teaching practices, and baking that into their coursework, it might be a more direct line to the intended outcome looking at the observation scores.

Tom Reagan, dean, Arts and Sciences, Great Basin College, said in 558, section 10, it specifies *provided that no changes have occurred*, and allows the superintendent to recommend renewal of a program. He asked if there will be definitions of level of changes, such as a course title in an approved program, what would constitute a review, and what the review looks like for a renewal. Does it look similar to the initial application? Does there need to be a review team? Deputy Durish responded that changes to an approved course of study and a review of a continuing course of study with no modifications, similar to alternate route programs, would require reconvening members of the field to contemplate the examples of the type's changes being considered.

Mr. Reagan noted that 558, 12 (b), specifies *termination of employment of completers or non-reemployment is five percent or greater*. He asked if the five percent would be within the first year or throughout the probationary status and if throughout the probationary status is it five percent of cohorts, or completer cohorts? Deputy Durish responded this language has been in the regulation from the beginning and to her knowledge the data has never been collected. She suggested the regulation specify *terminated from employment within the first year or within the first two or three years* noting that Nevada probation is three years. Dr. Canavero said it was his understanding that it is an academic year and limited to an academic year. In response to Dr. Reagan's question, whether it is an annual measure, Dr. Canavero said he did not know if the annual measure includes just the first year or if it includes an aggregation of all. Deputy Durish said they could clarify language to specify, terminated from employment, or who are not reemployed after their first full academic year.

Mr. Reagan asked what is the definition of a non-completer in NAC 391.558, 13 (a) *reporting of program completers and non-completers*? Deputy Durish stated three groups would be appropriate. Those who are currently enrolled those who have dropped out and those who pursued another major.

Melissa Burnham, associate dean, College of Education, University of Reno, said she is hopeful that a similar alignment with similar requirements will be in place or put into place for ARL program review as well as traditional or comprehensive programs. Based on the numbers in the state and the anticipated numbers of candidates that will be prepared by alternative route programs versus traditional programs, it will be important to have comparable data to see how candidates are performing in the field.

Deputy Durish noted they are currently discussing program approval. Statute there is an annual evaluation by the State Board concerning courses of study approved by the Commission, which is the ARL.

Ms. Burnham referenced NAC 391.558, 2 (c) and asked what if a program is applying for multiple tracks, is this one teacher for one of those areas, or would a teacher be needed for each of the areas for which the program is applying for. Ms. Sposito said the intent is to have an individual with the content and expertise on the review team. Language indicates the full time educator is the person that would vary based on the type of program offered. Eventually there will not be enough people willing to review programs that meet all of the

criteria. Deputy Durish responded it could be a challenge if reviewing a special education program and an early childhood non-special education program because portions of the program would be the same, such as the initial application. Either way some fidelity will be lost.

Ms. Burnham noted in NAC 391.558, 12 (b), it specifies *the percentage of probationary license to educational personal*; and that is not in reference to those with a probationary license, but rather to those who are still in their probationary period of employment? Deputy Durish agreed, there are provisional and conditional licenses, but no probationary licenses. That term references employment status. She said she would add to the definition of non-completers, that there were three groups, those who are non-completers because they are current students, those who have changed majors or slipped off the radar, and it is important to capture the numbers that are removed. Also, information could be provided about those who were not accepted in the program in the beginning. Of 50 that applied, 25 were not admitted due to not meeting the requirements.

The workshop closed at 3:10 p.m.

Workshop to Solicit Comments on R031-16, Proposed New Regulations of the Teach Nevada Scholarship as cited in Senate Bill 511.

Dr. Canavero opened the workshop at 3:10 p.m. There were six individuals present in Carson City and 11 individuals present in Las Vegas.

Deputy Durish informed that S.B. 511 has two pieces, one is new teacher incentives, and the second portion is the Teach Nevada Scholarship, allowing the Board to adopt regulations and carry out the provisions of the Teach Nevada Scholarship. It is a new scholarship and there are questions about implementation.

Ms. Spósito provided details about the language in [R031-16](#) that prescribes the manner in which scholarships must be awarded, the requirements for teacher program providers, scholarship recipients and requirements of payments to a teacher program provider and the repayment of money if a recipient leaves the teaching program before graduating.

Discussion ensued about the scholarship recipient providing information that they;

- were employed for at least 3 years as a teacher at a public school in the state and;
- were at a Title I school that received an annual low rating of underperformance of a public school with a high teacher vacancy rate and;
- maintained employment as a teacher at a public school for five consecutive school years.

Public Comment on R031-16

Dr. Melissa Burnham noted that in the beginning of section 2 it states, *as used in this chapter, teacher program provider” means a public or private university, college or other provider of an alternative licensure program.* Dr. Burnham said it seems to limit this in regulation to only ARL, and asked if that is the intent. Deputy Durish responded that is a clean-up proposed in language. Feedback indicated that is the way the bill is worded, that it is only for ARL programs whether they are private, university or college based. However, it is clear through testimony that was not the intent of the law. In the meantime the regulation cannot be changed to supersede the law.

Ms. Burnham responded she wanted to be sure we are not regulating ourselves out of the ability to provide scholarships potentially to an institution that provides a first time licensure program that is a year in length instead of five weeks.

The workshop closed at 3:30 p.m.

Public comment #2.

There was no public comment.

The meeting adjourned at 3:31 p.m.